

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabe et al. (US 7,161,576) in view of Winker et al. (US 6,710,831).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the features of regulating an amount of light emitted from the light source in accordance with a value of maximum luminance of the video signal, wherein the regulated amount of light includes 0%, 100% and a value therebetween; and adjusting transmissivity of the display device in accordance with the regulated amount of light in a manner such that the transmissivity of the display device increases and the regulated amount of the light decreases. Applicants respectfully submit that Kawabe and Winker do not teach or suggest such a combination of features.

Regarding Kawabe, Applicants note that this reference discloses the use of a liquid crystal display device that is able to control a light emitting amount according to a predetermined timing (see Fig. 18). For example, as shown in Fig. 18 of Kawabe, it is disclosed that the "lighting timing 1807 for the backlighting is turned ON at the High level and OFF at the Low level" (see col. 26, lines 57-58). Accordingly, in Kawabe, the light emitting amount is either 100% (when the light source is turned ON) or 0% (when the light source is turned OFF).

Regarding Winker, Applicants note that this reference discloses an LCD device that is able to operate in a reflective mode, a transmissive mode, and an intermediate mode in which a tunable mirror and a backlight are operated at intermediate states (see col. 11, lines 60-65).

Thus, in Winker, the use of an intermediate mode is disclosed, in which the backlight operates at an intermediate state.

As noted above, claim 1 recites the feature of regulating an amount of light emitted from the light source in accordance with a value of maximum luminance of the video signal, wherein the regulated amount of light includes 0%, 100% and a value therebetween. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kawabe and Winker does not disclose or suggest such a feature.

In particular, it is noted that while Kawabe discloses that a light emitting amount is either 100% (when the light source is turned ON) or 0% (when the light source is turned OFF), and Winker discloses a backlight which is able to operate in an intermediate state, Applicants respectfully submit that neither reference discloses the ability to regulate an amount of light emitted from the light source in accordance with a value of maximum luminance of the video signal, as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, as noted above, claim 1 has also been amended to recite the feature of adjusting transmissivity of the display device in accordance with the regulated amount of light in a manner such that the transmissivity of the display device increases and the regulated amount of the light decreases. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kawabe and Winker also does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

In particular, it is noted that while Kawabe discloses that the “response of the liquid crystal is fast in the display area 7804 based on the corresponding transmissivity response waveform 7818” (see col. 29, lines 26-28) and that the “transmissivity is substantially near the

desired transmissivity” (see col. 29, lines 29-30), Applicants respectfully submit that Kawabe does not disclose or in any way suggest that the transmissivity is adjusted in accordance with the regulated amount of light in a manner such that the transmissivity of the display device increases and the regulated amount of the light decreases, as recited in amended claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Winker fails to cure this deficiency of Kawabe.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kawabe and Winker does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants note that this claim has been amended to recite the features of a light source-controlling unit operable to regulate a light-emitting amount of the light source in accordance with a value of maximum luminance of the video signal, the regulated light-emitting amount including 0%, 100% and a value therebetween; wherein said video signal-adjusting unit adjusts transmissivity of the display device in accordance with the regulated light-emitting amount in a manner such that the transmissivity of the display device increases and the regulated light-emitting amount decreases.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Kawabe and Winker do not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 8-10 depend from claim 7 and are

therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants note that this claim has been amended to recite the features of a light source-controlling unit operable to regulate a light-emitting amount of the light source in accordance with a value of maximum luminance of the video signal, the regulated light-emitting amount including 0%, 100% and a value therebetween; wherein the video signal-adjusting unit adjusts transmissivity of said display device in accordance with the regulated light-emitting amount in a manner such that the transmissivity of the display device increases and the regulated light-emitting amount decreases.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Kawabe and Winker do not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 13-15 depend from claim 12 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has indicated that claims 5, 11 and 16 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.


III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryouta HATA et al.

By: 
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/ra
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 31, 2007